REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are currently pending in this Application. Claim 1 is amended with this Response. Applicant respectfully thanks the Examiner for acknowledging receipt of the priority documents in this Application.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 1-8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,164,551 to Altwasser ("Altwasser" hereinafter). Applicant respectfully traverses.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Applicant's claim 1 recites *inter alia*,

"Resonant detection or identification antenna of the type comprising *a single turn which comprises at least one electrically conducting wire*."

Altwasser does not teach an antenna comprising a single turn that comprises at least one electrically conducting wire. Instead, as described at column 4 lines 61-67, and as shown in Figures 1-4, Altwasser teaches coils 1 and 2 that each comprise two coil turns. As Applicant's amended claim 1 requires a single turn, Applicant respectfully asserts that Altwasser does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of Applicant's amended claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that anticipation does not exist regarding amended claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not further rejected or objected and is therefore allowable. As claims 2-7 and 10 variously depend from claim 1, they are thus correspondingly allowable. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 2-7 and 10 is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Altwasser in view of United States Patent No. 6,600,420 to Goff ("Goff" hereinafter). Applicant respectfully traverses.

For an obviousness rejection to be proper, the Examiner must meet the burden of establishing that all elements of the invention are disclosed in the prior art and that the prior art relied upon, coupled with knowledge generally available in the art at the time of the invention, must contain some suggestion or incentive that would have motivated the skilled artisan to modify a reference or combined references. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In Re Wilson*, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970); *Amgen v. Chugai Pharmaceuticals Co.*, 927 U.S.P.Q.2d, 1016, 1023 (Fed. Cir. 1996).

Claim 9 depends from claim 1. As such, for at least the reasons set forth in the remarks above, Altwasser does not teach every element of Applicant's claim 9. Therefore, as Goff does not remedy the deficiencies of Altwasser with regards to claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that the proposed combination of Altwasser and Goff does not teach every element of Applicant's claim 9. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that *prima facie* obviousness does not exist regarding claim 9 with respect to the proposed combination of Altwasser and Goff.

Since the proposed combination of Altwasser and Goff fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 9, clearly, one of ordinary skill at the time of Applicant's invention would not have a motivation to modify or combine the reference, or a reasonable likelihood of success in forming the claimed invention by modifying or combining. Thus, here again, *prima facie* obviousness does not exist. *Id.*

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Altwasser in view of United States Patent No. 7,154,449 to Liu ("Liu" hereinafter). Applicant respectfully traverses.

For an obviousness rejection to be proper, the Examiner must meet the burden of establishing that all elements of the invention are disclosed in the prior art and that the prior art relied upon, coupled with knowledge generally available in the art at the time of the invention, must contain some suggestion or incentive that would have motivated the skilled artisan to

modify a reference or combined references. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In Re Wilson*, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970); *Amgen v. Chugai Pharmaceuticals Co.*, 927 U.S.P.Q.2d, 1016, 1023 (Fed. Cir. 1996).

Claim 11 depends from claim 1. As such, for at least the reasons set forth in the remarks above, Altwasser does not teach every element of Applicant's claim 11. Therefore, as Liu does not remedy the deficiencies of Altwasser with regards to claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that the proposed combination of Altwasser and Liu does not teach every element of Applicant's claim 11. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that *prima facie* obviousness does not exist regarding claim 11 with respect to the proposed combination of Altwasser and Liu.

Since the proposed combination of Altwasser and Liu fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 11, clearly, one of ordinary skill at the time of Applicant's invention would not have a motivation to modify or combine the reference, or a reasonable likelihood of success in forming the claimed invention by modifying or combining. Thus, here again, *prima facie* obviousness does not exist. *Id.*

Conclusion

The prior art rejections herein overcome. Entry of the present Response with Amendment and prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

Applicant hereby petitions for any extension of time necessary for consideration of this Response.

Please charge any fees due with respect to this Response, or otherwise regarding the application, to Deposit Account 06-1130 maintained by Applicant's attorneys.

The Office is invited to contact Applicants' attorneys at the below-listed telephone number regarding this Response or otherwise concerning the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____

Daniel R. Gibson
Registration No. 56,539
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115
Customer No. 23413

Date: October 30, 2007